DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 916 CG 004 093

By-Fort, Joel

Youth--How to Produce Drop-Ins Rather Than Drop-Outs. Research Resume Number 38.

California Teachers Association, Burlingame.
Pub Date Nov 68
Note-13p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.75
Descriptors-Adolescents, *Dropouts, *Drug Abuse, Institutional Environment, Marihuana, Narcotics, Socialization, *Socially Deviant Behavior, *Student Alienation, Student School Relationship, Teenagers, *Youth

The subject of youth in America lacks definition and young people are often given stereotyped labels. The reaction of others is frequently to the implied stereotype, rather than to young human beings. The life styles of youth involve questioning the Establishment and its goals, seeking to define the good life and working to create a better America. In doing so, many adopt life styles which differ from that accepted by the ordinary American middle class. Adult society calls attention to the drug scene, particularly in the legal sense, while continuing to overlook adult usage of other drugs having comparable effects. Sexual mores of young people are decried while older generations practice illegal sexual behavior. The radicalism ascribed to youth is actually a characteristic of a small percentage, the mood of most being apathetic. The institutions of society will have to become responsive to the individuality of young people and to allow the influence of youth to be a real force. Youth needs encouragement in seeking a sense of identity. They need to be met honestly in their search for answers to life-meaning for themselves and society. (AE)

ED030916

CALIFORNIA
ADVANCE SHEET COPY
NOT
FOR SALE
BOOK STORE

B(8)

Proceedings of the 20th Annual State Conference on Educational Research "Educating Activist Youth- A Challenge to Research"

CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

$1.00

CG 004093

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

YOUTH--HOW TO PRODUCE DROP-INS RATHER THAN DROP-OUTS

Joel Fort, M.D.

(Joel Fort, M.D., is Lecturer (Professor), School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley; and Department of Biology, San Francisco State College. Prior to his present positions, Dr. Fort was founder and former Director, Center for Special Problems, San Francisco Department of Public Health.)

There are many parameters and dimensions of youth and youth behavior in America. First of all, as with all subjects and things that we define as problems, it is important to define what we are talking about. Youth itself is a nebulous concept, and as one's age advances, the upper range of the bounds of youth also seems to become quite flexible. Secondly, it appears to be necessary to many that some one between the ages of fifteen and twenty come under special labeling. We use such labels as "juvenile," "adolescent," "teenager," and once we have labeled them as such, we react to the label and the associated stereotype much more than to the particular individual. Ideally, we should think or talk about youth either as young adults or individual human beings who happen to be within a certain age range rather than continually categorizing them.

Along with labeling and stereotyping, we have a great deal of polarization where extreme positions develop--strong emotional attitudes--and we react to these polarized views rather than being able to perceive the shades of grey in the continuum that exist with all kinds of human behavior. Young people in America can be seen as our largest minority group, with the possible exception of women. Both youth and women in many ways are reacted to or dealt with as minorities. Their rights and privileges differ from those accepted as the majority's, and additionally, young people, as Edgar Friedenberg once pointed out, are "our last colonial population." There are many similarities between the way the British Empire dealt with some of its distant colonies, and the way that we deal with our young people.

Then we have the matter of defining the "youth problem." One

should not take at face value what is meant by "problem" in connection with youth, and we certainly should be aware that the definition of problem was not handed by God to Moses on a stone tablet, but varies from age to age and involves a great deal of arbitrariness and subjectivity. Howard Becker, the sociologist, has coined a very useful concept here, that in any given society there are a group of moral entrepreneurs who define for us what is a problem, what is not a problem, and how the "problem" should be reacted to. Usually they give us a one-dimensional pseudo-solution rather than discussing things in their full complexity. Such arbitrariness reminds one of the perhaps apocryphal tale of Gertrude Stein's death. As she lay dying in Paris, her long time companion, Alice Toklas, is supposed to have said to her, "What is the answer?" And she is supposed to have responded with the statement, "What is the question?" That is more profound than it may seem on the surface: we are as a people brainwashed to accept the definitions made for us by other people. We reward those who make a career out of viewing-with-alarm. It is much easier to view with alarm about a given subject than to point with pride and certain people have launched very successful political careers on this basis.

Youth life styles describing some of the kinds of life style that young people live, some seem quite obvious, while others tend to be neglected and ignored. One very common life style that is not much talked about we could label as "ordinary American middle class." A second, much more talked about one, is an activist life style including the young radical. Equally talked about is the hippie life style. Then there is the life style of the minority group member, now talking about the black, red, or brown American, other specialized racial and religious minorities in our society, and the ghetto inhabitant in general. There is the student life style, and another increasingly common life style as draft boards become more aggressive, the soldier life style. Some of these obviously overlap: people can be in several categories.

DROP-OUT. One particular aspect of youthful life styles that merits detailed comment is the so-called "drop-out" phenomenon. There is much concern expressed about this--often crocodile tears, but some serious concern. Again, it is hard to know what the word means. It appears to mean, as commonly used (particularly in political campaigns), somebody who either does not hold a "regular" job, or somebody who works less than a five-day forty hour week. If taken literally, this would include most teachers, most ministers, and a number of other very respectable positions in our society. That kind of definition is obviously not adequate since it would include too many "respectable" people.

Touching briefly on the drug scene, one of the common concepts about dropping-out is that perfectly normal well-adjusted, mature, healthy young people--if there are such people in our society--suddenly smoke pot or drop acid and are transformed into a drop-out. This kind of magical thinking about the way drugs operate pervades our society, because it is much easier to attribute a complex social phenomenon to some very simple thing like taking a drug or a particular political philosophy. That saves one from thinking, and thinking appears to be increasingly hard work for most Americans.

Actually, if a drug has anything at all to do with dropping out, it interacts with a person's already formed attitudes, beliefs, predilections, etc. and the hippies or others to whom the label is applied are people who already had dissatisfaction with their family, with society, or with many aspects of their life. If it does anything, the drug will simply work to intensify that dissatisfaction or perhaps make them more aware of it. In any case, the drug certainly will not act to create basic discontent about the quality of the individual's life and the quality of the society when that did not exist previously.

Furthermore, dropping-out involves far more people in different ways than is normally considered. There are many millions of Americans, for example, with no real involvement in their daily work or even in their leisure time activities. They are bored, frustrated, and dissatisfied. Most of them return home at night in a condition of tension and dissatisfaction, and turn on with alcohol, nicotine, tranquilizers, or a variety of other drugs. They are no more involved in the society around them than is the small group usually singled out as drop-outs. If there is real rather than hypocritical concern about the whole phenomenon of uninvolvement or disinvolvement, it must be a far broader concern than the way it is usually expressed.

Several other things should be mentioned about the hippie life style. It must be understood that what we see presently as a hippie, (leaving aside the question of what is a hippie--and there is no really good definition of that term--) is not what would have evolved naturally, because in many parts of America a very successful war has been waged on hippies, particularly in San Francisco. This war has been won by steady escalation--although nuclear weapons were not used, perhaps because Wallace and LeMay had not yet arrived. In any case, the phenomenon has been drastically altered by this war on the hippie conducted jointly by the San Francisco Health and Police Departments, and we will probably never know the more positive and constructive things that would have come from the hippie movement. One of the things that we should be aware of is a deep-seated belief by the core group of the hippie community that one must change oneself in order to change society. This concept in a sense makes one become a model for others to identify with. Many of the ideals are no more bizarre, no crazier than the ideals of Christianity is a wonderful thing, but it's too bad it has never been tried. One can say something very similar about the hippie philosophy insofar as it has never been really very widely tried.

Another specific component of the hippie philosophy was a dissatisfaction with what were called the "structure freaks" referring to people who are prisoners of the bureaucratic-political process, people who accept as a given right of their day-to-day life the establishment structure around them, becoming as one of the more popular buttons describes it, (having a picture of Adolf Eichmann in the center of it) "I was just doing my job." Great dissatisfaction has been directly and indirectly expressed about our society through the hippie way of life. A kind of flexibility, a different kind of radicalism--in a sense a different kind of anarchism--is involved to some extent, and should be seen as somehow relating to the radicalism used to describe aspects of what is now called the New Left.

A final comment on dropping-out. It is one of the ironies of our society that while all this concern has been expressed about a relatively small number of white middle class youths dropping out, there has been and continues to be a much larger number of black young people for decades who have dropped out of high school. This is not talked about as a problem by the public or the mass media.

MOOD. Something should be said about the moods that people can assume, particularly young people. The most common mood abroad in the country--the mood affecting the greatest number of people, young and old--is some combination of apathy, resignation, and/or acceptance. This mood takes for granted that things are as they are, perhaps voicing some dissatisfaction at times, looking for a hero every four years that may magically change the picture, but not really being very much involved in things.

Then there is the theme or mood that one could call alienation or pessimism. In this connection, several quotations apply, although written at a different period of time than presently: "Why are the times so dark? Men know each other not at all, but governments quite clearly change from bad to worse. Days dead and gone were more worthwhile. Now what holds sway? Deep gloom and boredom, justice and law nowhere to be found. I know no more where I belong." That was written by a fifteenth century French poet, showing that the theme of alienation and pessimism is not unique in our time although it is perhaps more intensified and pervasive now than ever before.

Another concept that expresses some of the alienation and some of the sense of outrage that people now called radicals feel is this quotation from Henry Miller: "If we were wide awake, we would be instantly struck by the horrors which surround us. We would drop our tools, quit our jobs, deny our obligations, pay no taxes, observe no laws." That brings to mind an anecdote about Thoreau, who was in a Massachusetts jail for non-payment of taxes as a protest and Emerson came to visit Thoreau and asked him "What is a person like you doing in there?" Thoreau is supposed to have said to Emerson, "What is a person like you doing out there?"

Another mood that merits consideration is optimism. One can define optimism in many different ways. One definition which gives some perspective is that the optimist sees this as the best of all possible worlds while the pessimist believes the optimist may be right. Young people traditionally have been thought to have great optimism, and stemming from this optimism, considerable initiative and energy that could be directed towards constructive social change. Joseph Conrad summarized this very well when he said in one of his stories, "I remember my youth and the feeling that will never come back, the feeling that I could last forever, outlast the sea, the earth, and all men."

SEX. Looking now at some of the activities of young people that have aroused interest and sometimes concern, five or six main categories can be perceived. These are sexual activities; drug use; social change; work; marriage; and studying. It is not quite clear what people are concerned about in terms of youth's sexual activities, as with most vague emotional

discussions. In some ways, denunciation of the young has always been a popular practice of adults and as someone once said, "it also is a valuable aid to their digestion." There sometimes almost seems to be a concern about sexual activity that they are heterosexual rather than homosexual and a concern that they are promiscuous rather than totally faithful to one person. The ideals of adult society reflected in such comparisons is far from being the reality in that promiscuity, extramarital and premarital, and a variety of other kinds of "deviant" sexual behavior is certainly not unknown among the older persons in our population, and in fact is increasingly common. Thus there is a great element of hypocrisy involved in this and other denunciations of the young. Actually, the sexual ethic of many young people is not one of promiscuity at all but rather of sex within a broader, more total affectional relationship between the two people. It is usually not simply a physical relationship. That may not make any difference to many people whose official position is simply based upon premarital versus marital sexuality, but nevertheless, it is important to understand what is really happening. Secondly, the changes that we are told have occurred in sexual behavior are not as great as they are often made to seem. The great sexual "breakthrough" actually occurred in the 1920's and not in the 1960's: relatively there appears to have been a much greater liberation of sexuality in the third decade of this century--certainly the greatest freeing of women that has occurred. The changes since that time are not as extensive, but the main difference now is that we talk more openly about sex than we talked about it before, and the gap between what people say they believe in, and what they actually do sexually has become somewhat narrower. Contrary to the impression we are given by certain successful politicians most young people in our society are not simultaneously copulating in the streets, smoking pot, dropping acid, and rioting, all of which, of course, are complex acts in themselves, and would be very difficult to do simultaneously. This is the kind of impression we are often given by the Reagans, Rafferty's, and Wallaces, and it typifies the distorted view we have of many things. There often seems to be an element of envy in what the older generation says about young people.

DRUGS. In terms of drugs, most discussion of the subject is in the narrowest possible context. "Honorable" men have taught us that the word "drug" means simply marijuana, LSD, and narcotics, and these honorable men have maintained that the only possible way to deal with these substances is to make criminals out of everyone who uses them or is in a room with someone using them. And of course, as with foreign policy and other crucial aspects of our society, honorable men don't lie and can't be wrong. Since that image of honorable men and of our leadership is not accurate, specifically on the drug subject, it is impossible to understand the use and abuse of any one mind-altering drug apart from the full context of drug usage in our society, and apart from the full context of the society in which it occurs. Drug usage is a barometer of the society and a symptom of much underlying social pathology. It has become popular to argue about whether America is sick or healthy---and the concept of sickness is sometimes overdone---but certainly, there are a great many things wrong, or at the least, many things that could stand improvement. Drug usage reflects many of these things and does not occur in a vacuum.

The full context of drugs for anyone who wants to make any sense out of it, must begin with the most widely used and abused of these mind altering drugs, alcohol, used and abused by both young and old, legally and illegally, remembering age restrictions. In the true context, nicotine is the second most used and abused, by both young and old, legally and illegally. Next come drugs half way in between full social encouragement and mild concern: sedatives, stimulants, and tranquilizers. Only then do we come to those things that have been selectively seized upon for attention as the drug problem: marijuana, LSD, and narcotics.

The word narcotics, for example, means scientifically opium or its derivatives, morphine, heroin, or synthetic equivalents used in medicine for the relief of severe pain or for other specific medical complaints. A number of drugs are falsely and harmfully lumped together in the law with narcotics, including marijuana, in all states; in most states, cocaine; in other states, LSD; in some states, as in California, peyote, while LSD, which produces the same effect is in a different law called the "dangerous drug law" where people are subject to misdemeanor penalties while those possessing peyote are subject to felony penalties. As it has become clear that some drugs that have been called "narcotics" are not narcotics, a new concept has crept into our language: "soft narcotics." This is a beautiful term for the professional distorter because it implies that even though a drug is not a narcotic it is still a narcotic, but it is somehow "softer" than some vague but horrendous concept of "hardness." Nobody knows what the hardness means, but they react to the total concept with great hysteria.

Then there is the failure to distinguish between the use and abuse of a drug, so that most of the time people are reacting to ordinary use without defining what the problem is in any objective way. They are accepting as the problem the simple fact of drug use. One problem, of course, that concerns people, is illegality. If we are all sincerely concerned about law and order and correcting the criminal aspects of the society, we should first of all in the drug field, be aware that most use of alcohol and tobacco by those under twenty-one, involves a willful and deliberate violation of the law, often with the collusion and active participation of parents or other adults, and that if we were to consistently and justly enforce all of the drug laws, including alcohol, tobacco, and as a distant third, marijuana, we would for the first time eliminate overcrowding in American schools. There would hardly be anybody in most classes, at the high school level or above.

The best way to define the problem is first of all to have a definition of abuse rather than using "drug abuser" for anyone who is unpopular and who uses a particular drug, applying it more scientifically to mean excessive use of a drug to an extent that produces measurable impairment of one's health or social or vocational adjustment. That is not actually a very complicated definition to apply. If in connection with a drug such as alcohol somebody is injured in a highway accident; if in connection with a drug such as alcohol or amphetamines or LSD somebody develops a psychotic reaction; if in connection with a drug such as alcohol someone has permanent liver or brain damage; if in connection with a drug, someone should lose his job because of excessive use or have marital conflicts; all of these would be drug

abuses with the particular drug that the person was using to excess. The use of a drug--as opposed to abuse--can be one time or occasional; some of it would be regular; some regular use would be daily; and only some daily use would involve large amounts. Finally, only some of that would involve addiction, because only three of the drugs or drug families in this full context are capable of producing addiction, namely alcohol, barbituates and other sedatives, and narcotics, meaning again, morphine, heroin, opium.

Physical dependence or addiction involves an actual physiological process with a withdrawal illness when the drug is discontinued. As it has been acknowledged they have stressed a new concept that marijuana and other drugs long talked about by the drug police as "narcotics" are not narcotics and don't cause addiction or psychological dependence. This simply means habituation: one becomes so used to something psychologically, and that something need not only be a drug, that when it is no longer available, you become restless, irritable, out-of-sorts, and do not know what to do with yourself. This habituation can and does occur with all the mind-altering drugs. It certainly can and does occur with marijuana, it occurs often with alcohol, caffeine (in our coffee, tea, and Coca Cola) and nicotine (tobacco) and happens with each of the others. Furthermore, there are many millions of Americans who for many years have spent three to four hours a day in front of their television sets. When the tube suddenly burns out, they become restless, irritable, out-of-sorts, and do not know what to do with themselves. They are psychologically dependent on television, and depending on one's values, this may be as much of an impairment of their self-development and of society's welfare as psychological dependence on a particular drug might be. This can only be judged in the full context of their life.

We have been taught to be concerned about the concept of hardness again without defining it. What does hardness mean? First of all, extremists of all sides and hopefully those in the middle would agree that death is a very hard phenomenon. So that any drug whose use is associated with death would be considered a hard drug in that dimension. We then have to begin with alcohol and its abuses. There are 6 million alcoholics in America out of the 80 million users of this drug. One of the major and most common complications of alcoholism is cirrhosis of the liver involving permanent destruction of the liver tissue. Cirrhosis is the sixth leading cause of death in America, fourth in San Francisco, and certainly the deaths from that and the disabilities prior to the premature death must be considered a very hard phenomenon indeed.

Continuing, concern about death as a hard phenomenon should also imply concern about the 50% to 70% of the 53,000 deaths and 3 million severe injuries on the highways of America each year which are associated with excessive consumption of alcohol. Concern would also be extended to the millions of needless premature deaths and major disabilities from lung cancer, heart disease, and hypertension from chronic cigarette smoking.

Another dimension of hardness would certainly be psychosis. A drug which had a great liability for producing psychosis would be dangerous from that standpoint. This would mean that alcohol must again be listed

first, since 20% of the people in our state mental hospitals are there with chronic psychoses from alcoholic brain damage. Amphetamines with chronic excessive use produce a toxic psychotic reaction. LSD can sometimes produce an acute or prolonged psychotic reaction. There are many different dimensions, in other words, of hardness involving different drugs and the concept is meaningless unless the dimension is defined and the various drugs which can lead to this particular effect are enumerated. All drugs including aspirin can be harmful or dangerous depending on how they are used, and certainly guns which are almost totally uncontrolled can be "hard."

The problem then becomes much simpler to define. One sees that there are many problems about many different kinds of drugs, and that we have been lied to about what the real problem is--we are not dealing at all with some of the most serious social and criminal problems associated with drugs in the full context, whereas we are over-deploying financial, police, and other resources to deal with less widely used and abused drugs. Drug use is a complex sociological and public health matter, not properly to be dealt with by criminalizing everyone.

RADICALISM. We are also led to believe that among the other terrible things that young people are doing is "radicalism." Most young people are by no means activists. Most of them, like most older people, are in the mood category I described as apathy, acceptance, or resignation, rather than being involved in changing the society. Probably the number of "extreme radicals"--those who get all the attention of the mass media---is less than a few tens of thousands.

CONCERNS. Examining some of the specific concerns voiced by a large proportion of young people--not merely by activists--one can say on the basis of the folk-rock music that is so diffuse it has become our pop culture, the kinds of songs that reach the hit parade now as compared to past decades ("Universal Soldier," "Little Boxes," and many Bob Dylan songs) that there is growing dissatisfaction in high schools and colleges. Among the specific concerns are the War, with young people leading the nation in recognizing that we are involved at the very least in an ill-advised and obviously unsuccessful war, and at the most, an illegal, immoral war which is destroying our society and helping totalitarianism. Another concern voiced by young people is a concern about the leadership of our country--the ineffectiveness and ineptitude of the people designated or elected as our official leaders. The Tweedledums and Tweedledees facing us in this election or in many others, the mediocrities. The main crisis in America is a crisis of mediocrity and senility. Most of our institutions are led by men who are quite old biologically, and if not biologically, they are certainly old in spirit. As young Julian Bond put it at the Democratic National Convention, "You people don't even know what we're talking about." Before problems and crises can be met, what is real must be understood and priorities given. The people in charge of solving our problems are often the people who created the problems in the first place. This leadership paradox of our society, until remedied, will prevent meaningful social change.

Young people are rightfully concerned about the widespread

hypocrisy in contemporary America. Probably the one word that epitomizes our society is hypocrisy. Youth correctly points to the enormous gap between the ideals and the practices of society. Whether in terms of politics, law, religion, drugs, whatever, this element of hypocrisy is obviously prevalent. They point to the inequities of our system of "administration of justice," the variations in law enforcement, with different socio-economic and racial groups, often with different age groups. A number of our laws, especially those dealing with drugs and political dissent, serve a scapegoating function. There are those, including the Governor of California, who, judging from their pre-election and post-election statements, would if they could, make it illegal to be young in America. Being barred from doing that, unfortunately from their standpoint by such outmoded institutions as the Bill of Rights, they seize upon practices most prevalent among the young, as a device to attack and scapegoat them. Unless we recognize the symbolic aspects of certain kinds of laws and attitudes, we really miss the point. Marijuana, for example is far more than just a drug. There have to be very deep-seated and complicated reasons why it has gotten so much attention. Using the Man-from-Mars metaphor, if such a person came here, looked around, read our newspapers, saw our television, and heard what we talk about, he would properly conclude that marijuana is more important than racial conflict, poverty, disease, and even war because hardly anything gets the attention given to this drug. It has become the main symbol of the generation gap, also has the scapegoating value, and serves as a smokescreen. Politicians or aspiring politicians can seize on the marijuana issue without danger of offending powerful interests or financial backers; they can distort the facts and glorify alleged evils at will. The extreme laws passed easily without medical or sociological testimony in the 1930's because the drug was used mainly by out-groups (Negroes, Mexican Americans, jazz musicians, intellectuals) without political influence.

BEYOND DRUGS. There continue to be those who single out marijuana as the most important thing in life, particularly the agencies which are psychologically dependent upon it and thrive upon engendering hysteria by discussing the issue totally out of context. Certainly for both young and old, there are far more important things in life than marijuana, alcohol, and tobacco, and if society is going to make progress we need to move beyond marijuana and beyond our acceptance of the industrial slogan, "Better Living Through Chemistry." Americans will have to learn to relate to one another without popping pills, taking a drink, or smoking various kinds of cigarettes. It is interesting, parenthetically, that so many older people wonder why young people are interested in drugs when we live in a drug-ridden society where parents and other adults constantly demonstrate that they cannot live without drugs, and hundreds of millions of dollars are spent in promoting drug use through advertising.

Another thing that youth is questioning is poverty--why in an affluent society, an overdeveloped society economically, with such an enormous gross national product as constantly extolled by our leaders--why 30 million people need to live in poverty and why 10 million of those live in hunger? There is no adequate explanation or excuse for this. The fact of the matter is that they should not be living like this. They are also

leading the way in expressing concern about racism in America. Racism should be more broadly conceived, that is, we should concern ourselves with bigotry, intolerance, and hatred in general and with our practice of picking out superficial aspects of a person and reacting to that rather than to what the person is as a human being. Included in that are such things as beards, miniskirts, sandals--we all know how dangerous those things are--and of course skin color is another superficiality that we have seized upon as a focus for discrimination and bigotry. One of the controversial things that many such young people do is to accept people as fellow human beings despite such superficial differences and this practice could well be shared by all.

A final area of concern is about the future--what the young person should expect in the remainder of his life. This presents a somewhat dismal picture for many. Of course one's subjective values come into this, but despite individual values, it is correct to say that a large and increasingly number of American youth do not see as meaningful the education they are presently involved in, or the jobs they will probably be holding when they escape the educational system. They recognize, although they perhaps do not verbalize it in this way, the validity of Friedenberg's comment that the purpose of our present educational system is to assimilate young people into the middle class achievement-oriented society rather than to provide a meaningful individualistic kind of program for them.

ENEMIES OF THE YOUNG. The initial enemy is the Establishment in general--that is, the way the institutions of society are organized to suppress individuality particularly with young people; the way bureaucracies are run; and in general the lack of influence permitted young people in these institutions so that they do not feel a part of them. Often parents, teachers and the political or administrative leaders are the main manifestations of this establishment enemy, and receive the brunt of more deep-seated discontents.

Another group seen as an enemy by a large and growing number of young people is the police. In looking at police and the crime problem, we should not only look at the branches of the problem of criminality, but as Thoreau suggested once, "there are a thousand people hacking away at the branches of evil for every one striking at the roots." We need to look at the causes of disrespect for law and the police, some of which come from improper or corrupt police practices, some of which involve imitating the adult world's disrespect for law in the way they speed in their cars and cheat on their income taxes thereby communicating their real values about law to their children. Police practices themselves, with drug and sex behavior, and in Chicago on the two new TV programs "Beat the Press" and "Mace the Nation," help to engender disrespect and even hatred for police. The hypocrisy of the maladministration of justice mentioned earlier is another factor.

A series of national surveys on the real behavior of people by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice in 1967 revealed that 90% of Americans had committed acts sometime during their life which would have resulted in their imprisonment had they

been apprehended. That 90% figure did not include most traffic, alcohol and other drug, and sex offenses, which if added together (since most sexual practices commonly engaged in are illegal), would give us at least 99% of Americans as lawbreakers and criminals.

WHAT DO THEY WANT? What is it that young people are seeking? Partly, they are seeking a better world and an improved quality of American life. Certainly we do not have a quality of society that we could or should have --- we do not have a great society or a creative society.

Young people are also seeking more idealism and morality. It is interesting how little the adult world talks about morality, it is almost a passé concept. As an extension of this people rarely think through what they are working towards, what their goals are and what concerns they should have about other people. Altruism has passed out of most lives--people don't often engage in saying or doing good things for, or about, other people. Some young people are indeed seeking a utopian society and not in a totally unrealistic manner because most of them recognize the difficulty in completely defining or attaining a utopia. They also recognize, however, as President Kennedy was fond of quoting, "a journey of a thousand years must begin with the first step." Finally, they are aware that people who do not become part of the solution remain part of the problem.

Many seek a sense of identity or inner direction since, as Reisman has pointed out in *The Lonely Crowd*, most of us are outer-or other-directed as opposed to being inner directed. Such a search is highly important for our youth and should be not only permitted but encouraged. To understand the concept of identity think through how we usually are identified by other people or how we identify ourselves when asked. For example, identity often becomes a matter of a birth certificate and social security card, or what one's occupation or title is, rather than a determination of who you really are, what you really stand for, or what you should be. Authenticity and meaning are closely related to this search as are the quests for significance or relevance in life.

The generation gap, among other things, involves a power struggle. It is popular to say that adolescents have always rebelled against their parents which seems to make the matter more understandable or easier to cope with. While some such rebellion has always occurred, it has never been as pervasive or complete as presently. The basic assumptions of the older generation and of authority in general are being thoroughly challenged for the first time. Adult moral judgment in general is being questioned along with the accepted belief that one is automatically wiser through being older. The concept that people because of greater age should have the highest positions is no longer acceptable. In a sense we have the radical idea of the consent of the governed being desired by many young people and required in order to give legitimacy to the policies and institutions of society.

Discussing youth and youth problems must of necessity imply at least a working knowledge of what is a good life; what are the goals of a meaningful life; and what is progress? Is it automatically progress to have

two television sets, expensive new schools and more freeways? Producing drop-ins necessitates all of us asking and answering such questions, transmitting higher values and practices to the youth, and making education and life itself mind expanding rather than mind contracting as they too often are.

W. H. Auden in *The Unknown Citizen* poetically illuminates the concerns of many young people today. It begins: "He was found by the Bureau of Statistics to be one against whom there had been no formal complaint." It ends with these words: "Was he free? Was he happy? The question is absurd, for had anything been wrong, we certainly should have heard."